

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 17 to 19 and 21 have been amended to clarify that both the base stations and the subscriber stations in the fixed wireless network are fixed.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Applicants submit that Stilp does not disclose a “fixed wireless access communications network comprising a plurality of fixed base stations and a plurality of fixed subscriber stations” as recited in Claim 19.

Applicants note that Stilp is concerned with “methods and apparatus for locating wireless transmitters, such as ...enhanced specialized mobile radios” (Column 1 line 8 to 9). Nowhere does Stilp state, or even suggest, that the transmitters are fixed in position.

Therefore, Stilp does not show all the features of Claim 19 and Claim 19 is not anticipated by Stilp.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would recognize that if the subscriber stations are fixed, as recited in the independent Claims, for example by mounting the antenna of the subscriber station on a building as described on page 1 line 27 of the present invention, there would be no need to locate the position of the subscriber station as described by Stilp. The person skilled in the art would therefore not even consider combining the disclosures of Stilp and Rappaport as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 17 and 18 would not have been obvious in view of Rappaport in combination with Stilp.


Applicants further submit that Claims 2 to 5, 8, 10 to 13, 15 and 16 would not have been obvious in view of Rappaport in combination with Stilp for at least the reasons given above.

A proper Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are now urged.

November 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.  
Registration No. 26,935  
Barnes & Thornburg  
P.O. Box 2786  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786  
(312) 214-4800  
(312) 759-5646